

*Application No. 10/673779*  
*Page 7*

*Amendment*  
*Attorney Docket No. 011.2B-11335-US01*

**Amendments To The Drawings:**

**None**

**RECEIVED**  
**CENTRAL FAX CENTER**  
**MAR 13 2007**

MAR 13 2007

*Application No. 10/673779*  
*Page 8**Amendment*  
*Attorney Docket No. 011.2B-11335-US01***Remarks**

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action dated **October 13, 2006**. An extension of time is required to make this response timely. Applicant requests the required extension of time in an attached request, if not included, the introductory paragraph to this response makes the proper request.

The Examiner kindly provided a voice mail set of instructions to clarify the October 13, 2007 Office Action and what is required for a response. Since the prior amendment faxed on August 18, 2006 was not transmitted well, the arguments made therein along with the amendments to the claims are being repeated herein as though for the first time. This will ensure that the Office has a good clean copy for the printer on allowance of claims.

This Amendment adds new claims 18 to 28 which are fully supported by the application and are believed to be patentable over the cited references. Applicant is submitting a Declaration from Shuhei Yamada in support of the patentability of the invention. Mr. Yamada is more than qualified to state what one of ordinary skill in the art would believe based on the cited references. His statements show that the combination of references does not support a conclusion that the invention as claimed is obvious.

The Office Action mailed October 13, 2006 considered the declaration and arguments to the extent that the poor fax transmission was legible. Further elaboration is provided below.

The cited art references are to Inoue et al. which is directed to polishing of wafer surfaces and Tanaka, which is directed to polishing of wafer edges. As explained by inventor Kawase of this application in U.S. Patent 6,280,652, wafer edge polishing is for a very different reason than surface polishing. Edge polishing is to smooth the edges for handling purposes and

*Application No. 10/673779*  
*Page 9*

*Amendment*  
*Attorney Docket No. 011.2B-11335-US01*

to increase the strength of the edge to prevent cracking and chipping. While desirable, wafer edge polishing must not harm the wafer surface, which is all important. Thus, most edge polishing is directed toward polishing which does not scatter compositions on the wafer surfaces ending up as dried gels.

In marked contrast, surface polishing of the wafer is absolutely critical. Without proper surface polishing, the wafer value is greatly diminished or lost altogether. Any imperfections means that the wafer may not usable with ever increasing demands to etch even more information onto the wafer surfaces.

The inventors herein found that the proper combination of compositions and carefully control of the average primary particle size as well as the average secondary particle size will reduce surface haze problems associated with prior compositions. None of the cited references disclose or suggest an average primary particle diameter size. Nothing in the cited references disclose or suggest that primary and secondary particle sizes may influence surface haze.

There is nothing in the combined teachings and suggestions of the two references that would make one of ordinary skill in the art combine them such that the instant claims would be obvious. While one of ordinary skill in the art would be aware of edge polishing, there is little reason to take that limited knowledge and assume that its compositions may have utility on wafer surface polishing. In addition, there is nothing in the references that supports a finding of obviousness based on the required average primary and secondary particle diameters.

MAR 13 2007

Application No. 10/673779  
Page 10

Amendment  
Attorney Docket No. 011.2B-11335-US01

**Conclusion**

It is respectfully submitted that the composition as claimed represents a patentable composition for wafer surface polishing that greatly reduces hazing in marked contrast to the cited prior art, alone or in combination. Claims 1-5, 7-10 and 18-28 are patentable over the cited combination of references. It is requested that the restriction be reconsidered and that the remaining claims should be rejoined in this prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

VIDAS, ARRETT & STEINKRAUS

Date: March 13, 2007

By: \_\_\_\_\_

Scott Q. Vidas

Registration No.: 30812

6109 Blue Circle Drive, Suite 2000  
Minnetonka, MN 55343-9185  
Telephone: (952) 563-3000  
Facsimile: (952) 563-3001

Enc: Declaration of Shihei Yamada, Petition to Extend Time

f:\wpwork\sqv\11335us01\_and\_20070313.doc